

living at it. I should have been in favor at the beginning of this discussion of the adoption of the hour rule. Upon any subject likely to arise in this Convention, if proper notice is given of the limitation, I think an hour is enough. Ordinarily speaking, that notice being given, no gentleman will desire to occupy over an hour. The adoption of the rule will lead to condensation, and will greatly relieve speakers in the Convention. But I do not think it is right now, the rule not having been made before the debate was opened, to apply a new rule to this particular subject. It is not fair to gentlemen upon the other side; nor is it fair to those upon our side; because it does not follow, and is not true in fact, that on all the intricate points so eloquently raised and discussed by my colleague, yesterday, that he has the concurrence of all on our side. A great many of those points, the most interesting and important of them are abstractions, theoretical, involving opinions upon the philosophy of politics and statemanship, upon which, without any difference in the conclusion arrived at, there may be a difference which gentlemen, irrespective of their political position may desire to explain. After some gentleman upon the majority has been heard, I shall be as ready as at any time to proceed and state my own views upon these questions; and I think I shall give them within an hour. I will endeavor to do so. But then I do not want upon this particular question to be necessarily restricted to an hour. I should wish some latitude if I should desire to go a few minutes over.

Mr. STIRLING. I entirely agree with the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Belt,) with regard to the propriety of the one hour rule; but I really cannot appreciate the objection to it in this case. So far as notice is concerned, we shall all have the notice, if this order is adopted. Nobody has spoken but the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke.) The adoption of the rule therefore applies equally to all members and to both sides of the House. If anybody has any advantage, it is the gentlemen who are friendly to the views already very elaborately and fully argued on yesterday, for they will be saved the trouble of going over a great deal of this ground. It may be an advantage to us all not to have adopted the rule, until after the information contained in that speech had been given to the Convention. I therefore do not see any difficulty as to the time of the adoption of this order. I was opposed to the amendment limiting the time to thirty minutes, thinking that too short a time, although I do not expect to wish or exceed that myself. I think an hour is enough for any member, in any legislative or representative body, upon any subject upon which there will be a long debate. I earnestly hope the Convention will adopt the regulation. It will afford each

member ample time. I do not feel able to listen to long speeches. Certainly eight or ten hours is a good deal to give to this subject, or to any other subject, unless we intend to stay until next fall.

Mr. SCOTT. Suppose there are five or six more on one side than on the other. Must we makemen speak on one side who have nothing to say or shut the mouths of the other side?

Mr. NEGLEY. Certainly not. When one side is exhausted the other will go on.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Gentlemen will see at once that this is impracticable, I am sure. There may be members who generally agree with what is called the majority, but who on particular measures may not agree with them. There may be some of us who do not agree with either the majority or the minority. My venerable friend from Kent (Mr. Chambers) belongs to no party; as he has assured the Convention. Under this rule, we should be debarred entirely from the privilege of listening to him at all, which I should very much regret. Then there are a great many different parties. There are five or six Democracies, counting the new one, the "Radical Democracy," and if we are to attempt to alternate through all the parties, we may find ourselves in confusion. I hope the amendment will not be pressed to a vote.

Mr. CHAMBERS. The difficulty in consequence of the peculiar position of the gentleman from Kent may be obviated in one of two ways: either a committee may be appointed to designate the names of those belonging to the majority and the minority; or perhaps the Convention will oblige me by adding a proviso that the rule shall not apply to the delegate from Kent. I should not be likely to address the Convention beyond an hour on any question. I will submit, as I am bound to submit, to whatever the majority of this House, composed of whatever materials it may be, shall ordain. I can only say that I protest, in the name of that liberty which I think the representatives of the people of the State are entitled to demand, to have their wishes through their delegates expressed, just so long as those delegates may think it necessary, against any effort to suppress debate by any rule or order, or in any other mode, and thus to stop the mouths of those who I think are entitled to be heard. It is not the province of every man to condense. You must send for some operator, or some steam apparatus as suggested by the gentleman from Howard the other day, to condense the ideas of some gentlemen. Some have the happy talent of the gentlemen from Cecil and Baltimore City, of condensation. Others are not possessed of that faculty. Providence has not given them that power. I do not think they or their constituents should suffer for this affliction which is certainly not within their control.

Mr. SANDS. I would only suggest to the